DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 269 JC 850 072

AUTHOR Murdoch, Allene
TITLE Priorities within the Mission: A Background Paper.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 22p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 3 at a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, March 7-8, 1985).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; *College Role; *Community Colleges; Educational Philosophy; *Governing Boards; Legislators; School Districts; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Designed to provide information for the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges' review of the state's Master Plan for Higher Education, this two-part report presents background on recent research on the community college mission and describes processes currently available to the Board to establish priorities within the mission. Part I of the report begins with a review of historical developments affecting the mission of the community colleges since the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. Next, the recommendations of recent publications dealing with the future of the community colleges are summarized; two views of the community college (as a flexible, market-oriented provider of a wide range of educational services or as an institution providing more traditional college functions) are contrasted. The final sections of part I describe statewide developments in California related to mission, including ad hoc activities, and planned and more purposeful attempts to clarify the community college mission. Part II focuses on state-level decision making as it affects mission priorities, providing an examination of the current structures, decision-making entities, and the tools available to set mission priorities. This section looks at the various methods available to the Legislature, the Board of Governors, and local districts for esablishing priorities, and current and projected efforts to evaluate mission priorities. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Hayward
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254269

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
March 7-8, 1985

Item 3

Title: Priorities Within the Mission:
A Background Paper

Staff Presentation: Allene Murdoch
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor

Summary

A major review of the Master Plan for Higher Education will begin in California during 1985. While all segments of postsecondary education will be under consideration in the review, a reassessment of the community college mission will be the first aspect of the study. The Board of Governors had called for a Master Plan review in its 1984 Basic Agenda and has planned major activities for 1985 related to the mission reassessment. It is in the interest of the community colleges for the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office to plan carefully their role in the mission study and the Master Plan review.

This item is presented for Board information in preparation for the Board's involvement in the Master Plan review. Its purpose is to provide background on recent research on the community college mission and to describe processes currently available to the Board of Governors to establish priorities within the mission. Further staff work is planned on the implementation and impact of statewide mission objectives. Action recommendations are anticipated for the July meeting.

This item contains the following:

I. BACKGROUND ON THE MISSION

A. Historical Developments Complicating Mission

B. Brief Review of Recent Commentaries on the National Reassessment

C. Description of Statewide Developments Relating to Mission

II. STATE LEVEL DECISION-MAKING AS IT AFFECTS MISSION PRIORITIES

A. Use of the Term "Priority"

B. Who Decides About Priorities?

C. Evaluation of Statewide Priorities

D. Proposed Work on the Impact of Priorities

JC 850 072

I. BACKGROUND ON THE MISSION

A. Historical Developments Complicating Mission

The 25-year history of community colleges since the development of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education is a history of success in responding to the open-door policy for community colleges. In California, the Master Plan for Higher Education charged higher education, and community colleges in particular, with providing educational opportunity to previously unserved segments of the population. That commitment to access resulted in unparalleled growth in enrollment and unprecedented diversity of students during the 1960's and 1970's. Community colleges have led the way in reaching out to serve all segments of the population.

Current concerns relating to the mission arise out of that success. Problems of size and diversity have led to public concern over the community college mission. By 1975, community colleges were serving one out of ten adults in California. The end of an era of growth in California is marked by scarce resources and competition for students. In addition, the diversity of community college students, the hallmark of success in the 1960's and 1970's, has led to questions in the 1980's about the quality of education as the diversity of students in college classrooms stretches the capability of the institutions beyond a reasonable ability to respond. Growth and diversity of students have also led to the charge that community colleges have expanded their mission.

In fact, the mission of the California community colleges has remained remarkably consistent despite their growth and the diversity of the students served. The major elements of the mission as envisioned in the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education were open access and a comprehensive curriculum including academic, vocational, and civic or community education. These elements were present with the first colleges and have remained to the present.

As early as 1975, community college growth was a state issue in California. During that year, a cap was placed on community college growth as state policymakers sought to limit the budget. The visibility of the community college mission issue in California, however, dates from the passage of Proposition 13, the first of a number of taxpayers' revolts occurring across the country. As responsibility for funding shifted from college districts to the State, a new sensitivity concerning accountability emerged in the Legislature. State policymakers became interested in bottom line questions of cost and benefit. Competition for state resources grew and legislators struggled to understand the complex system and unique governance structure as they were being asked to approve the fourth or fifth largest single item of the State budget.

BEST COPY

B. Brief Review of Recent Commentaries on the National Reassessment

1. Views of the Restructuring

The upcoming review of the community college mission in California through the Commission for Review of the Master Plan is best seen in a national context of reassessment. Across the country, educational researchers and commentators concerned with the future of community colleges are grappling with the challenge of clarifying or redefining the community college mission. The following are recent attempts to address what community colleges will be doing over the next few years:

- Financing Community Colleges, David Breneman and Susan Nelson, 1981. The authors recommend a division of labor among educational institutions with community colleges enrolling fewer transfer students and retaining dominance in activities not traditionally undertaken in four-year institutions.

- "Missions and Function of the Community Colleges," California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1981. This report examines the question of whether traditional functions of offering transfer programs, occupational preparation and general education are suffering in comparison with continuing education. One radical alternative presented in this report would have community colleges offering all courses on a noncredit basis with a credit option for students wishing to meet standards of rigor. The effect would be to provide greater flexibility and responsiveness to community interests.

- The American Community College, Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer, 1982. Advocates a strong, interdisciplinary general education curriculum to provide training in citizenship, basic values, and skills to function in society. The Miami-Dade reform follows this concept.

- "Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service," Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (under Clark Kerr) 1979. Confining its recommendations to young people, the Council proposes a restructuring of education with high school students attending community colleges for vocational training and community colleges providing extensive information, advisement and referral services.

- "Community Colleges on the Plateau," Journal of Higher Education, K. Patricia Cross, March/April 1981. The results of a study to assess the emerging goals of community colleges. Cross found that the educational ethos of the 80's had not emerged and that only vocational and general education were given top ranking by all constituent groups.

BEST COPY

- The Community College: Values, Vision and Vitality, Edmund Gleazer, 1980. A long-time president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Gleazer argues for community colleges as centers of lifelong learning with community as "process and product."

- The Impossible Dream? Financing the Community Colleges' Evolving Mission, Richardson and Leslie, 1980. This monograph examines the relationship between community college funding mechanisms and the evolving mission. Among its recommendations is a recommendation to limit programs and services to those for which adequate funding is provided.

2. College for Community or Traditional College

Looked at in simple terms, interpreters of the future mission are divided in the following way: those who argue for colleges for the community and those who view community colleges as traditional colleges. Put another way, the community college, according to the first group, is a flexible, market-oriented provider of a wide range of educational services, including continuing education for part-time adult students. The second group favors a return to emphasis on the more traditional college functions in the interests of quality and effectiveness.

The Miami-Dade model would be one example of the implementation of the latter view of the emerging mission. Prompted by findings of a 1975 self study, President Robert H. McCabe undertook a major reexamination of Miami-Dade's general education curriculum. The changes at Miami-Dade, however, went beyond reform of curriculum. They included academic advisement, tracking, and probation policies and practices carried out through systems technology.

Among commentators as well as practitioners there is no consensus on the mission, but all commentators agree that the mission of the community colleges of the future will be different than when the open door was the unifying purpose. Commentators on the community college mission also share the view that a full and open discussion of the mission is in order. In addition, a number of researchers have noted the difficulty of rational debate on the community college mission issue. The fervor of advocates of community colleges is seen as an obstacle to clearsightedness. Breneman and Nelson note that community colleges have been strong on advocacy and short on analysis. George Vaughan, himself a community college president, has suggested that the "rhetoric of leadership" has done little to elucidate the issues facing community colleges.

BEST COPY

In addition, most researchers acknowledge the need for reform from within and the need for choices to be made regarding the character and composition of educational programs and clientele. Interestingly, even the most vigorous recommendations for restructuring the community colleges do not represent a rejection of the longstanding functions of general education, transfer education, occupational education and community or continuing education. Further, there is agreement that to the extent that they are offered, educational programs must meet the following standards:

> General education must develop a holistic and integrated framework for understanding and using knowledge.
>
> Transfer programs must prepare students just as well as universities and colleges do for upper division work.
>
> Vocational programs must prepare students for entry level jobs as well as advancement in their chosen occupations.
>
> Community education must respond appropriately to the educational needs of a wide range of people and organizations.

Mission considerations resolve into recommendations regarding emphasis and priorities within the established functions and the important questions of who shall be served, who should pay and who should decide these matters.

C. Description of Statewide Developments Relating to Mission

1. California's Community College Mission Defined by Exclusion

In California, the tensions over diversity of students, the extent and nature of college educational programs, and declining fiscal resources have resulted in a number of actions which have had an impact on the mission. While they have not been framed as being related to mission, a number of uncoordinated, ad hoc activities related to funding have had bearing on the mission. In 1983, Patrick Callan, Director of CPEC, commented that:

> "...education researchers have noted that disputes over the levels and methods of funding in the community colleges often stem from unresolved differences in opinion over the mission, functions and priorities for community college education. It seems to me that this is exactly what has happened during the past five years in California. As we have moved from the credit/noncredit issue through the implementation of the Course Classification System and the $30 million

BEST COPY

budget cut, the mission of the colleges has been defined by exclusion -- what the State won't fund -- rather than by any clear statement of statewide interests and priorities. In fact, major issues such as funding cannot be discussed independent of mission. State policymakers have been insistent that little progress can be made in resolving the fundamental issues in financing until broad agreement is reached about the purpose and function of the two-year colleges."

It is generally agreed that priorities for community colleges should not be determined through the method exemplified by the $30 million course cut. Abrupt, uncoordinated excisions from the colleges' eductional programs disrupt planning and educational processes from the state level to the classroom.

2. Steps to Define Mission by Reassessment

Three planned and more purposeful state-level attempts to clarify the community college mission have occurred in California subsequent to the events of 1982.

a. Board of Governors Statewide Statement of Mission

The first was the development of a statewide mission statement by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. The statement, adopted by the Board in December 1983, was developed through a planning activity of the Board with review and refinement by a Blue Ribbon Committee made up of community college representatives. The statement stands as the Board's current view of the mission of the community colleges. The 1983 statement differs from a 1976 Statement of Philosophy and Goals principally in the values ascribed to program functions. The Statement identifies the various programmatic and service functions for community colleges and indicates whether they "will" or "should" be provided. While these indications of priority do not have the force and effect of law, they are being used by the Board as it develops its Basic Agenda as well as its statewide priorities for the evaluation activities being coordinated with the Western Association Accreditation Commission.

Another contrast to the earlier statement was the identification of remediation and student services listed as distinct program functions.

b. Basic Agenda

A second planned activity related to the mission was the development of a Basic Agenda in late 1983. The Basic Agenda for 1984 served as the Board of Governors' plan for . . .

BEST COPY

policymaking for the year. Based on an analysis of statewide problems facing the community colleges, the Basic Agenda focuses on issues that are of sufficient magnitude to warrant state level attention and that are appropriate to the arena of the Board of Governors. The development of an annual planning document for the Board of Governors is of value to the colleges and to other state policymakers in providing leadership and focus for policy development. It allows involvement in planning through its review and comment procedures and has met with a high degree of acceptance among the colleges. The 1985 Basic Agenda identifies funding, educational quality, mission review, governance, and state level administration as its principal policy concerns for the year. It has also identified programs for emphasis. The 1984 and 1985 Basic Agendas targeted transfer and vocational education for emphasis. Much of the policy work of the Chancellor's Office flows from the Board's Basic Agenda.

c. Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education

A third development was the enactment of legislation to review the mission of community colleges along with the Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570, SB 2064, ACR 162 -- 1984). This upcoming review will have major implications for the colleges. The entire Master Plan review will not be complete until January 1987, but the mission review of community colleges is scheduled to be the first component of the study.

By December 31, 1985, a 16-member Commission for Review of the Master Plan is slated to assess the mission of community colleges and report its findings and recommendations to a 14-member Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education. A summary of the provisions for the assessment is appended to this item (Appendix A).

3. Priority by Mandate or by Policy Direction

The $30 million excision, the issuance of a Board Mission Statement, and the development of a Basic Agenda are responses to the need for mission priorities. The legislative excision of $30 million in recreational and personal development classes was an indirect expression of a mission preference.

Two other examples cited, the 1983 Board Mission Statement and the Basic Agendas for 1984 and 1985, are strikingly similar in their concerns but different in their application. As in the case of the course excision, priorities within the mission are affected, but in a less radical way in the policy documents. In the 1983 Board Statement on Statewide Mission, a division of functions into those which "will" be offered and those which "should" be offered creates a hierarchy of sorts. The Basic

BEST COPY

Agenda identifies activities for the most critical priorities. For two years this document has named transfer and vocational education as program priorities for emphasis. College districts have not been required to adopt these priorities or to implement them.

The priorities in the actions initiated by the Board of Governors are statements of statewide interests, and are intended to guide rather than direct districts. The Board of Governors' policy documents have also served as the basis of the work plan for staff in the Chancellor's Office. Great variety among the colleges themselves, due to geographic, economic and demographic diversity, calls for flexibility in state policy. In addition, colleges must be able to change as educational needs change.

II. STATE LEVEL DECISION-MAKING AS IT AFFECTS MISSION PRIORITIES

The description in this item of recent activities affecting the mission identifies some of the ways in which mission priorities have been set. These events, however, are insufficient to provide a conceptual framework for proposing future policy regarding mission priorities. The remainder of this item provides a descriptive model for decision-making concerning statewide mission priorities. Through an examination of the current structures, decision-making entities and the tools available to set mission priorities, a rough delineation of what exists currently will be shown.

A. Use of the Term "Priority"

The Board of Governors first used the term "priority" in a 1982 draft of its 1983 statewide mission statement. The term was used in that document to identify goals, objectives or functions for emphasis. The introduction of this term was acknowledgement of a need to differentiate among the elements of the mission and was part of an effort to develop measurable statewide objectives. The slowing of enrollment growth and funding limitations made some ordering of values appropriate. Questions concerning educational quality also resulted in efforts to increase accountability. The term seems to imply a more general objective.

The community college reassessment study, SB 2064 (Stiern), retains the Board's mission language by calling for recommendations regarding "the priorities of community college functions" (Appendix B).

B. Who Decides About Priorities?

Aspects of decision-making concerning mission priorities are within the scope of all three levels of governance for the community colleges. Although decision-making points seems at time amorphous, a rough delination in the decision making structure exists in statute and in practice.

BEST COPY

The Legislature, the Board of Governors and local districts have a variety of methods available to establish priorities for the community colleges. There is considerable overlap in the tools available to each of these bodies, but some useful distinctions can be made.

1. Legislature

   a. Mandates

      Determinations about broad programmatic priorities and who shall be educated in community colleges has been done by the Legislature. The educational functions of community colleges are specified in statute as are the admissions policies.

      Education Code Section 66701 authorizes community colleges to grant the associate degree and to offer instructional programs which "may include but shall not be limited to standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services." This broad outline of educational functions does not establish priorities for courses or programs.

      With regard to admissions, Education Code Section 76000 requires local districts to admit persons having a high school diploma or its equivalent and "any other person who is 18 years of age and who, in the judgement of the community college if he is so authorized by the rule, is capable of profiting from the instruction offered."

      The differentiation of functions among the three segments of public postsecondary education by the Legislature has also been a major determiner of the community college mission with regard to who shall be served and programs offered. The Master Plan for Higher Education made community colleges a full partner in higher education when it specified them as provider of instruction"through but not beyond the second year of college."

      The Legislature also relies on significant advisory bodies in its educational policy decisions. The California Postsecondary Education Commission is one such body; it advises and evaluates all segments of postsecondary education. In recent years, a number of state level issues have been identified through CPEC reports to the Legislature.

      The Department of Finance is another entity playing a crucial role in many community college issues. In legislative matters, the Department of Finance presents the Governor's position on legislation. The annual budget is its major advisory responsibility.

BEST COPY

b. Funding Incentives and Disincentives

Funding incentives and disincentives are methods of affecting mission priorities through legislative mandates. The Legislature, through its power to appropriate funds, has a ready means of directing college programs. The annual budget creates incentives and disincentives affecting programs and students.

The $30 million course reduction announced the State's unwillingness to support courses "offered for private or personal benefit." This funding disincentive caused courses to be eliminated or shifted to fee support status.

Another disincentive, the different rate of funding for credit and noncredit classes, favors the offering of credit classes in community colleges and is another legislatively determined priority affecting community colleges. In some districts, this differential has had the effect of discouraging certain community college course offerings.

Examples of funding incentives established in statute are the separate apprenticeship rate, special federal funding for vocational education projects, and the state Fund for Instructional Improvement.

c. Intent language

Intent language is an expression of legislative intent which states a general policy position which is typically not amenable to legislation, although the language can be expressed through a bill. Often, intent language is stated as part of a related piece of legislation, or it is expressed in the form of a legislative resolution, which states a policy goal of the Legislature. ACR 81 is an example of intent language which ultimately had a substantial impact on the community college mission. ACR 81 called for a study of "the impact of student charges on access to public postsecondary education." This resolution led to the $30 million course excision and ultimately to the plan for a community college enrollment fee.

Recent expressions of legislative intent related to the mission have been ACR 83 (Resolution Chapter 68, Statutes of 1984) and AB 3938 (Chapter 1662, Statutes of 1984). ACR 83 requires the Board (along with the University of California Regents, the California State University trustees and others) to develop a plan to assess educational institution programs related to admission and retention of low income, ethnic minorities. AB 3938, enacted in 1984, expressed the intent that contract education will be a part of community college offerings.

BEST COPY

AB 3938 expresses the intent, among its provisions, that the report on contract education to be submitted to the Chancellor be submitted to the Commission for Review of the Master Plan.

2. Board of Governors

a. Mandates

Board of Governors' mandates generally take the form of regulations. The Board derives its authority for developing regulations from its responsibilities defined in statute.

Current Title 5 regulations have a limited direct impact on mission priorities. Section 55802 specifies the requirements of an associate degree but does not specify program or course emphasis except in one instance. This regulation is an expression of what the associate degree stands for and not what the community college curriculum overall should emphasize.

The exception to this is the ethnic studies requirement of this regulation. Section 55802(c) requires the offering of ethnic studies courses.

Regulations established as minimum standards derive from the broad statutory authority for the Board to set standards for the receipt of state aid. As with most other legislative mandates, minimum standards identify an achievable base level of performance which is verifiable. Minimum standards address matters of compelling state interest which are not addressed by other accountability mechanisms.

Minimum standards have not established program priorities, but rather processes to ensure quality programs. For example, Title 5, Sections 51020, 51021 and 51022 require that districts shall have objectives for educational programs, establish curriculum to meet the objectives, review curriculum, and articulate programs with other segments. The Chancellor's Office has review and approval responsibility for courses and programs for articulation with four-year colleges and high schools.

b. Funding Incentives and Disincentives

Funding incentives and disincentives are a method of affecting mission priorities which the Board has used to a limited degree.

BEST COPY

The funding of special projects is one tool for emphasizing program priorities. The Fund for Instructional Improvement, established through AB 1173 (Chapter 714, Statutes of 1977) provided funding totaling $783,000 for 1984-85. State funds for Employer-Based Training programs for 1984-85 totalled $1.9 million. Federal Vocational Education funds for 1984-85 provided another $2,594,000 for special projects. While federal vocational funds have restrictions for their use, the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office have funded primarily projects meeting statewide objectives for vocational education including projects to promote access to underrepresented groups.

As the implementation arm of the Legislature in protecting the State's interests, the Board of Governors could, in certain instances, use funding disincentives when districts fail to comply with state law or Board of Governors regulations. To date, the Board has not addressed mission priorities through this method.

c. Planning Priorities

The Board also addresses statewide priorities through its own planning processes. Mission priorities have been a focus of the planning done at the Board's annual retreats during the past three years. Beyond that, the 1984 and 1985 Basic Agendas have provided an orderly process incorporating the preliminary planning of the annual Board retreat into a formalized procedure for the identification of priorities. The annual priorities emerging from the Basic Agenda reflect a five-month development period, during which recommendations and comment are sought from community college officials and organizations, from legislative and executive branch members, and from interested state agencies. The 1985 Planning Calendar for Agenda items represents the translation of Basic Agenda policy issues into a staff work plan.

The Board's Futures Planning project is a further activity which has bearing on the Board's ability to provide leadership in identifying priorities. The examination of demographic trends and economic conditions will be completed in the spring of 1985. A number of planning premises and policy directions will contribute to the Board's upcoming work on mission priorities.

A major comprehensive planning effort, scheduled to be implemented in the fall of 1985 will provide the Board and Chancellor's Office with information regarding districts' own educational priorities and districts' responses to statewide priorities.

BEST COPY

Currently, the Board of Governors has no uniform approach to evaluating the impact of priorities identified through the Basic Agenda. The identification of the priorities and the activities initiated by the Board in the Basic Agenda have been a leadership activity which has encouraged a transfer and vocational focus for districts but has not taken any steps to assess the impact of these priorities.

d. Guidelines

Unlike funding incentives or disincentives written into law and unlike minimum standards, guidelines are not mandated and do not carry enforcement or monitoring requirements. Guidelines may provide standards and direction; they are meant to provide leadership. Guidelines are typically specific to one program and are not for general application.

Examples of recent guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors are: guidelines for child development programs and guidelines for bilingual education. The child development guidelines included standards for model instructional and care programs. The bilingual guidelines presented a model for a degree program with a bilingual/crosscultural emphasis.

These guidelines were developed through the work of task forces coordinated by the Chancellor's Office and comprised of college personnel who were program representatives and administrators.

Guidelines are also one possible outcome of another major Board effort related to remediation and the associate degree. The Task Force on Academic Quality presented its recommendations to the Board of Governors in January of this year. Its recommendations are currently under review.

3. District Governing Boards

As the provider of educational services, the colleges themselves have the greatest impact on the mission. In addition to the major responsibility for quality of instruction, districts have the responsibility for program choice and for admissions policies. The district determines who is "capable of profiting" from instruction (Education Code Section 76000). The district must carry out these responsibilities in accordance with existing law, regulations, and state policies.

BEST COPY

It is appropriate that program and course decisions remain within the scope of the districts' responsibilities. The tremendous variation among the colleges makes centralized decision-making related to courses and programs undesirable. Districts should have the flexibility to respond to local needs and to changes over time.

C. Evaluation of Statewide Priorities

Currently, the only statewide effort to evaluate mission priorities is being done through a voluntary component of 1984-85 accreditation self studies. Through the FIPSE project, Chancellor's Office staff has developed a working paper to assist colleges in evaluating their response to the Board of Governors' statewide mission. Colleges electing to do so as part of the accreditation process will evaluate the following statewide mission components:

1. Open admission
2. Assessment, placement, follow-up
3. Program evaluation
4. Transfer programs and articulation
5. Vocational programs
6. Liberal arts/general education
7. Student services
8. Remedial and basic skills
9. Continuing and community education
10. Community services

The Board is currently being asked to consider a joint agreement with the Accreditation Commission which would make this evaluation of statewide mission priorities a regular part of the accreditation process.

D. Proposed Work on the Impact of Priorities

Because policies and priorities differ in their acceptance and capacity for implementation, an array of strategies for implementation is necessary. It is the preliminary judgment of staff that the Board of Governors has a framework for setting priorities that is flexible and responsive. The next step in work on the impact of statewide priorities will be a survey of districts to assess acceptance and effect of statewide priorities as identified in the Basic Agenda. A further purpose of the survey will be to identify exemplary local initiatives in setting priorities related to the mission. The results of the survey is proposed for presentation at the May meeting of the Board of Governors.

Also proposed for the July meeting is a presentation on alternative methods available to the Board for setting mission priorities in the future and the impact of these various methods.

BEST COPY

REFERENCES

1. Benveniste, G. and Benson, C. "The Experience of the State of California and Its Relevance to European Education in the Year 2000." The Hague: Martinus Hijhoff, 1976.

2. Breneman, D.W., and Nelson, S.C. "Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective." Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1981.

3. Callan, P. "Testimony to the Assembly Special Committee for Community Colleges," California Postsecondary Education Commission, Director's Report (Oct.-Nov. 1983).

4. Cohen, A.M., and Brawer, F.B. "The American Community College." San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

5. Cross, K. Patricia, "Community College Missions in the 1980's." Harvard Education Review, Vol. 53, #4, November 1983.

6. Gleazer, E.J. "The Community College: Values, Vision and Vitality." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.

7. Hayward, Gerald C. "Testimony to the Assembly Select Committee on Community Colleges," Fall 1983.

8. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, and Service. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

8. McCartan, A., "The Community College Mission: Present Challenges and Future Visions." Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 54, No. 1, Nov/Dec 1983.

9. McCabe, R.H. "Now is the Time to Reform the American Community College." Community and Junior College Journal, 51 (May 1981), 6-10.

10. _____. Now is the Time to Reform the American Community College. Miami-Dade Community College, 1981.

11. _____. The Educational Reform at Miami-Dade Resulting in Improved Student Performance. Miami-Dade Community College, 1981.

12. _____. Why Miami-Dade Community College is Reforming the Educational Program. Miami-Dade Community College, 1981.

13. "Missions and Functions of the California Community Colleges," Commission Report 81-14, California Postsecondary Education Commission. Sacramento: May 1981.

14. Simpson, R. The Neglected Branch: California Community Colleges. Senate Office of Research, January 1984.

BEST COPY

15. Vaughan, G.B. and Associates. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

APPENDIX A

A Comprehensive review of the Master Plan for Higher Education is contained in an integrated package of three bills: ACR 162 (Hughes), SB 1570 (Neilsen), and SB 2064 (Stiern). Together, the three bills create a special commission and a Joint Legislative Committee for the purpose of reexamining the Master Plan. The Commission will represent all segments of higher education in California and will submit its findings to the Joint Committee for legislative action. The review of the Master Plan for Higher Education is scheduled for completion by January 1987.

Bills	Performance of the Studies	Description of the Studies	Timelines and Appropriation
ACR 162 (Hughes) *Establishes the Joint Legislative Committee and sets the broad objectives of the Master Plan effort.* Effective upon effective dates of SB 1570 and SB 2064. Sunsets 6/30/87	Establishes a 14-member bipartisan Joint Legislative Committee on Master Plan, appointed by the Rules Committee and Speaker, respectively, with: o 7 Senate Members o 7 Assembly Members	o Assessment of postsecondary needs through the year 2000 o Reexamine basic and lower division instruction, including community colleges as specified in SB 2064, Stiern o Develop strategies to increase in access and success of students, with emphasis on underrepresented students o Review of appropriateness of existing postsecondary delivery systems o Analysis of direct and indirect State costs for students in postsecondary education o Particular look a community colleges per SB 2064	Requires the Joint Legislative Committee to review the management plan of Master Plan Commission established by SB 1570 by March 15, 1985. Recommendations to the Legislature on the MP Commissions report due by 3/1/87.
SB 1570 (Nielsen) *Establishes the Commission and delineates its responsibilities.* Urgency bill (Effective immediately) Sunsets 6/30/87; Repealed 1/1/88	Establishes a 16-member Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, with: o 1 appointed by UC Regents o 1 appointed by CSU Trustees o 1 appointed by Board of Governors o 1 appointed from among CPEC members o 4 appointed by Governor o 3 appointed by Assembly Speaker o 3 appointed by Senate Rules o 1 appointed by Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities o 1 Superintendent of Public Instruction or his/her designee The Governor may designate any member as chairperson of the Commission. Appointees shall be citizens knowledgeable in the area of postsecondary education and shall be business and community leaders representative of the cultural, ethnic and geographic diversity of the state. Appointees may not be employed or retained by any public or private postsecondary educatic. institution.	The scope of the report includes but is not limited to: o Assessment of postsecondary needs through year 2000 o Reexamine basic and lower division instruction, including community college as specified in SB 2064. o Develop strategies to increase in access and success of students, with emphasis on underrepresented students o Review appropriateness of existing postsecondary delivery systems o Analysis of direct and indirect State costs for students in postsecondary education o Preparation, retention, articulation, accountability, matriculation	Requires that the Commission report a management plan to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan by March 1, 1985. The plan will include: o Timelines for interim reports o Staff resource needs Appropriates $500,000 without regard to fiscal year for costs associated with the review.

BEST COPY

SB 2064 (Stiern) *Defines a specific re-examination of the mission of the California Community Colleges and establishes this study as an early objective of the Master Plan Commission created by SB 1570* Urgency bill (Effective immediately).	Reassessment will be conducted by Master Plan Commission established by SB 1570 and is established as the Commission's highest priority by SB 2064.	Community College reassessment study within the context of lower division instruction, including: A. Comparison of statutory directives regarding courses, programs and activities required to be offered and those actually offered. B. Assessment and recommendations re appropriateness of these to CC's mission, especially with respect to functions of other State educational institutions, and priorities which should be given to: o Transfer programs o Vocational programs o Associate degree programs o Certificate programs o General education courses o Remedial and basic skills courses o Noncredit courses o Fee-supported community services o Student services o Other programs, courses and activities C. Assessment of current socioeconomic composiiton of community colleges students; academic quality; community services D. Recommendations to ensure that all California residents will have access to community college programs and services; and to ensure that the academic quality of community college programs and courses will be maintained and enhanced. E. Other policy recommendations regarding the missions of the community colleges or community college operations.	Requires the Commission to report its findings to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan by December 31, 1985.

October 17, 1984

APPENDIX B

MISSION REVIEW

(A) A comparison of the statutory directives regarding the programs and activities required to be offered by community colleges, and the programs and activities actually offered by community colleges.

(B) An assessment of, and recommendations regarding, the appropriateness of all of the following programs, courses, and activities to the mission of the community colleges, particularly with respect to the functions of other state educational institutions, and the priorities which should be given to all of the following programs, courses, and activities:

Transfer programs.
Vocational programs.
Programs leading to associate degrees.
Certificate programs leading to employment.
General education courses.
Remedial and basic skills courses.
Noncredit courses.
Fee-supported community services courses.
Student services, including, but not limited to, counseling, testing, job placement, and financial aid.
Other programs, courses, and activities currently offered by community colleges.

(C) An assessment of the current socioeconomic composition of community college students, and recommendations for methods to ensure that all California residents will have access to community college programs and services.

(D) Policy recommendations designed to ensure that the academic quality of community college programs and courses will be maintained and enhanced.

(E) Other policy recommendations regarding the mission of the community colleges or community college operations the Commission deems appropriate.

APR 19 1985

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

BEST COPY